DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 146 988 JC 780 003

AUTHOR Weddington, Doris
TITLE Partnership for Faculty Development: The University and the Community College.
PUB DATE 74
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Interinstitutional Cooperation; Interschool Communication; *Junior Colleges; Models; *Preservice Education; Program Design; Program Development; Staff Improvement; Teacher Improvement; Teacher Workshops; *Universities

ABSTRACT

Although deeply concerned, community college faculty often have not been prepared through preservice education or previous teaching experiences to teach adult students with the variety of needs and orientations now characteristic of the community college population. This paper proposes a total staff development program involving a partnership between the university and the community college which would require interinstitutional coordination, coordination with community social agencies and business and industry, and coordination with the administration and disciplines of the university. To achieve institutional coordination the following steps are required: (1) a frank discussion of needs by representatives of both institutions; (2) a listing and selection of cooperative activities; (3) written detailed commitments and responsibilities; (4) the establishment and continuation of a community advisory council; (5) a controlled increase of cooperative activities based on community college needs; and (6) the establishment of only one interinstitutional program at a time, with other community colleges added by the university only as prior programs are firmly operational. Universities should include both teacher training and assistance with community college inservice workshops and seminars. (Author/RT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED146988

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Doris Weddington

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PARTNERSHIP FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

By

Doris Weddington

JC 780 003

University of Texas, 1974

CONTENTS

	Page
THE PROBLEM	1
GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	7
FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS TO DATE	8
THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, PARTNERSHIP IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT	12
PRESERVICE PROGRAM: THE UNIVERSITY, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND THE COMMUNITY	16
INSERVICE PROGRAM: THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE UNIVERSITY, AND THE COMMUNITY	20
GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM	24
SUMMARY	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY	34

PARTNERSHIP FOR FACULTY DEVELOPMENT:

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE

"Democracy's college," the "people's college," "everybody's school"--these are all appellations frequently attached to the two-year community colleges which have mushroomed across the nation during the last decade. Developing from the stem of the sixty-to-seventy-year-old junior college movement, the community college seems to be a logical fruition in a society and in a time when equal opportunity for all has been the theme of governmental decisions and social reform. These colleges today offer such a wide variety of educational opportunity to such a diverse clientele as to defy description. With education now viewed in these institutions as a life-long right and privilege, it is no longer precise even to describe these institutions as "two-year" colleges. Perhaps the only concise definition still available to us is "non-baccalaureate-granting, non-profit institutions of learning for adults."

THE PROBLEM

One characteristic which community colleges increasingly have in common is an "open-door" policy, meaning that literally any adult (usually defined by the state as eighteen years old or over) may apply and will be received in the spirit of the Statue of Liberty inscription, and that the institution will endeavor to provide educational experiences which will enable him to begin where he is and to progress toward

his own personal and vocational goals. Throughout the nation, the people's college has been taken up on this promise by hundreds of thousands of individuals. The student body of a typical community college represents the same diversity in age, ability, academic achievement, and ethnic, socio-economic, and cultural background as is found in the community at large. The people also bring with them the same variety of needs and aspirations which can be found in the community which they comprise.

The doors of the community college were opened in response to a recognized need iterated as early as 1947 by the Truman Commission and brought into indelible focus by the civil rights decisions and minority unrest of the sixties (Monroe, 1972, Chapter 1). But no one really understood all the implications of swinging open the doors to all comers. People who had never succeeded in school before believed in this invitation as the offer of a miracle; people whose socio-economic condition had limited their exposure to the world of the affluent believed in it as the promise of another chance. Adults of all ages came--to change vocation in middle age, to make up for education not gained in an unsuccessful high-school experience, to learn to read and figure, to learn a trade for entry into the "good life" which comes with earning power, and to undertake the first two years of baccalaureate education without leaving home.

The community college was, to say the least, somewhat less than prepared for this diverse clientele and its variety of aspirations and needs. Vocational programs were established in which experienced craftsmen taught their trades to the uninitiated; faculty for Associate in Science programs were drawn from industry to teach the principles and

skills of their technology; English and mathematics instructors, having been prepared either for secondary school teaching or as specialists and scholars in their respective disciplines, attempted to set up courses to teach adults basic concepts and skills.

The characteristics and needs of the "new" students, however, were not easily anticipated and almost nothing was known about how to teach them. There existed no precedent in American education to serve as a model for educating these adults whose prototypes in previous generations had never been inside a school past mid-adolescence. Needless to say, thousands of students were disillusioned as they discovered to their dismay that their miraculous second chance offered only a replay of the same learning situations, the same teaching methods in the same culturally restricted environment which had forced them out of the educational mainstream in the first place.

These are the students William Moore (1970, p. 5) calls "high-risk" students--those whose "erratic high school records, economic plight, unimpressive standardized test scores, and race/cultural/class distinctions succeed in placing them at a disadvantage in contention with the vast majority of students applying for entry into college." Patricia Cross (1971, p. 30) has described this "new student" as a "failure threatened" rather than an "achievement oriented" individual--a result, of course, of the misfit between his personal and educational needs and his previous school environment and curriculum. For such students the very act of attempting further education represents risk-taking of the highest order. That thousands of such students have come to the community college with new hope only to experience once more the all-too-familiar academic failure is a fact we in the community

college will have to bear on our collective conscience. Our defense concerning the early days of the open door is simply that we did not know. There were no precedents, no experimental programs, no research data on which to model our new undertaking. We didn't know anything else to do but to give the student another chance at the only model for education we had at our command.

Today, the picture is quite different. Much experimentation has taken place concerning educational environment and methods, instructor attitudes, and institutional support conducive to enabling the new student in the community college to progress--at his own rate and in his own way--toward his educational and personal goals. Model programs now exist and have been reported in books and professional journals. The road to fulfilling our promise is no longer concealed in an unexplored wilderness; trails have been blazed. Still, effective special programs for minority and disadvantaged students are only a start in the right direction. Some studies have shown that high percentages of students who are successful in special programs designed to assist them in "catching up" fall by the wayside when they are again plunged into the mainstream of regular curriculum where cultural differences and individual styles and rates of learning are not considered or respected (Roueche & Kirk, 1973). There remain many community colleges who have still not tapped the source of experimentation and research in this new educational specialization; there are others who have established adequate "remedial" programs but lack the institutional commitment and preparedness necessary to provide for the needs of the new student beyond and outside of the remedial stages.

The problem of greatest magnitude facing the community college today is this: to discover and implement a means to make good on the promise of the open door. Since an educational institution is its staff, it seems so obvious as to need no justification that the major key to a solution lies in thoroughgoing programs of staff development.

The need for staff development in response to the changing needs of a diverse clientele has been recognized at the national level. The 1972 annual Assembly sponsored by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges spoke forcefully to this need (AACJC, 1973, p. 146), and the 1973 Assembly was devoted exclusively to a consideration of this issue (Assembly papers and recommendations to be published early in 1974). The importance of staff development has been recognized at the state level by at least one state legislature: Florida has instituted a state wide community college staff development plan with separate state level funding and coordination (O'Banion, 1972, pp. 105-106). A survey of 1207 community colleges conducted for the AACJC by José Chávez in 1973 revealed a ubiquitous concern among community colleges across the nation for staff development needs. The responses reported extensive, but uncoordinated, efforts on the part of individual institutions to "do something" about staff development. They also constituted a plea for help from the AACJC, from legislatures and other funding agencies, and from four year colleges and universities in their efforts to bring their instructional provision into line with the needs of the people now enrolling in their institutions.

Staff development needs are pervasive of every part of the institutional operation. To be optimally effective, staff development programs must extend to every employee of the community college--janitor, trustee, secretary, president, counselor, librarian, instructor, administrator--

and every constituency must be involved in the planning and implementation--community, administration, governing board, students, faculty, counselors, and support personnel. Agencies in the community, the local, state and national governments, the AACJC, federal agencies for education, and four year colleges and universities must all become involved if this mammoth retraining and reorienting of personnel is to be achieved. The recommendations of the 1973 AACJC Assembly (to be published in 1974) speak eloquently to the pervasiveness of the problem and map the road to reasonable solutions.

It is beyond the scope of this paper to delineate ways and means to effect all of the personnel development needed for the total community college staff. The group who probably have the most direct contact with students and the greatest effect on their well-being and academic achievement is faculty. This is also the group who, more than anyone else, have been caught in the middle. The institutions to whose work they are committed have changed so drastically as to make their previously adequate (even superior) preparation obsolete. Almost overnight, they are faced with tasks vastly different from those for which they were prepared and for which they were hired at the time they accepted the employment. In this paper we will project an "ideal" faculty development program--a composite of some of the latest efforts and newest ideas in preservice and inservice community college faculty development. In today's world, even this comparatively narrow phase of staff development could be viewed from many different angles. Our purpose will be to consider both preservice and inservice faculty development for the community college as it might be achieved through meaningful cooperative planned arrangements between a community college and a university.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The goal of faculty development in the community college and the goal of the university faculty preparation program are ultimately the same: that community college students will be served by faculty who have understandings and skills necessary to enable the students to grow and learn in keeping with their personal and vocational aspirations.

More specifically, it should be the goal of community college faculty development that every faculty member should possess the following characteristics:

(1) Understanding and acceptance of the philosophy and mission of the community college.

(2) Thorough knowledge of subject matter to be taught as it relates to the needs and goals of community college students.

(3) Understanding of interdisciplinary relationships and ability to coordinate with faculty in other disciplines where feasible through interdepartmental planning, team teaching, etc.

(4) Knowledge of learning theories; ability to evaluate learning styles and make tentative judgments concerning learning problems.

(5) A command of a variety of teaching methods (including appropriate use of media) which may be applied with different groups and individuals in keeping with the learners' needs and suitability to subject matter.

(6) Knowledge and skill in curriculum development including imaginative and responsible instructional innovation.

(7) Knowledge and skill in instructional evaluation.

(8) Acceptance of and empathy with the nontraditional student. (Nontraditional is defined as any student who would not have been in school at this point in his life in the days when post-secondary education was largely limited to traditional baccalaureate pursuits.)

(9) Awareness, understanding, and appreciation of cultural differences; knowledge of the characteristics of sub-cultures represented in the particular institution.

(10) Humanistic personality.

Another goal of an overall faculty development program should be to increase minority representation on the faculty until there exists an ethnic balance in all divisions of the institution similar to the proportions in the community.

Terry O'Banion (1972, p. 64) emphasizes the "humanistic personality" above all other characteristics of the individual who will teach; "Research has shown that the effective teacher's personality is secure and open to others. It is, in short, a 'humanistic' personality ... it cares for man before thing; it is the personality of the learner who helps others to learn." William Moore (1970, p. 71) states a similar view in these words: "Teachers of high risk students must be both sensitive and objective. They must be aware of many of the needs, appetites, problems, life and learning styles, and other dimensions of the student. In short, they must have the ability to empathize."

The characteristics listed above represent an overall goal for faculty development which should hold constant whether the focus is on preservice preparation or inservice development of faculty, whether the faculty member concerned has prepared for his position through years of practical experience without benefit of baccalaureate preparation or whether he holds a Ph.D. The diversity of the needs of the people in the people's college is so great that nothing short of the awareness, knowledge, understandings, and skills given above is truly adequate to meet the demands.

FACULTY DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS TO DATE

There are only two processes through which an institution can pursue the goals of faculty development: (1) selection of persons to

fill new and vacated faculty positions, and (2) development of desired characteristics in encumbent faculty. Staff development through selection implies that candidates will be available who possess the desired characteristics; this, in turn, implies the existence of preservice faculty preparation programs designed to prepare such candidates. Systematic development of the desired characteristics in encumbent faculty implies an effective inservice staff development program. Traditionally, preservice teacher preparation has been the domain of the university and inservice staff development has been the responsibility of the community college in which the staff were employed.

Preservice Faculty Development Programs

A survey conducted by the AACJC in 1973 (Chávez, 1973, p. 5) showed that "among a sample of 403 four-year colleges and universities which grant graduate degrees in education and other fields relevant to community and junior colleges, 132 offer programs and/or courses that are specific to the community and junior college field." Of these only a very small number are offering programs specific to the needs of the nontraditional student. The 1973 AACJC Staff Development Catalog (AACJC, 1973) lists the following numbers of programs specific to the community college field which contribute directly to those needs:

Continuing education	5
Appreciation of different cultures	2
English as a second language	1
Urban education	1
Communications development	1
English for disadvantaged students	1
Developmental reading	1
Developmental studies	1

An examination of "junior college" teacher preparation programs in four-year colleges and universities reveals that all too often they

consist of a very slightly modified version of the traditional specialized research-oriented master of arts program in a discipline major. Too often a single course entitled "The Junior College" constitutes the community-junior college orientation of these "specialized" programs. According to O'Banion (1972, p. 86), even more ludicrous is the fact that "the course on 'The Junior College' is often taught by a professor who has had no experience in and who has little understanding of the community-junior college." It is also common for candidates to complete such a "Junior College" program without ever having been inside a junior or community college and with no experience to acquaint them with the types of students they will be expected to teach.

Arthur Eastman of Carnegie-Mellon University, in a paper for the 1973 AACJC Assembly (1973, pp. 1-3), gives a frank and open account of the pitfalls which were encountered and the inadequacies which resulted from developing a program for the preparation of community college English teachers without advice from community college personnel. The result was that graduates once more found themselves steeped in subject matter specialization far beyond the scope of (and sometimes totally unrelated to) their teaching assignments while they lacked the understandings which would enable them to relate to the nontraditional student and the skills needed to teach him. "We had not read," he goes on to say, "for they had not yet been published, NCTE's 'Guidelines for Junior College English Teacher Training Programs' (1971), Dressel and Delisle's Blueprint for Change ... (1972), or O'Banion's Teachers for Tomorrow ... (1972), all of which heavily emphasize both initial and continued cooperation between universities and the colleges whose teachers they attempt to provide."

The 1973 AACJC Staff Development Catalog lists 85 university programs which attempt to prepare faculty for community college teaching (AACJC, 1973). While some of these are making progress toward the ideal held out by O'Banion and others, there is no account presented in the literature to date of a "model" community college faculty program yet in existence.

Inservice Faculty Development Programs

Despairing of help from the universities, many community colleges have reconciled themselves to the necessity of selecting staff from the ranks of secondary school teachers, recent graduates from specialized discipline-oriented masters programs, or the new surplus of Ph.D.'s and then "retraining" or "further preparing" these individuals for their new teaching specialization through inservice staff development.

The AACJC Staff Development Survey shows indication of high interest on the part of individual institutions in inservice faculty development. Six hundred ninety-seven institutions (out of 1207 contacted) responded to the questionnaire. Of those responding, virtually all of them indicated a commitment to staff development efforts of one sort or another. The types of staff development activities most often mentioned by these institutions were leaves of absence, sabbaticals, professional conventions, institutes, workshops, extended time and released time for research, consultants, faculty exchange, visits to successful demonstration sites, and use of in-house expertise. Five institutions mentioned faculty fellowships/grants, 24 mentioned tuition assistance to faculty, and two mentioned financing summer study (Chávez, 1973, p. 18).

From this survey, it is clear that the university plays a very small part in the ongoing staff development efforts of the community college. It would be interesting further to discover what courses are being undertaken by the faculty on those fellowship- or tuition-assisted programs of study. It is not likely that these courses are of the nature which will provide insights into the needs of the nontraditional student or skills with which to teach him because such courses are almost non-existent in most localities. O'Banion (1972, p. 61) lists as most frequent inservice activities "conferences; workshops, seminars and institutes; internships; professional publications ...; orientation; and evaluation." Again there is little involvement of the university implied.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE: PARTNERSHIP IN FACULTY DEVELOPMENT

Most of the inadequacies of university programs designed to serve the community college stem from lack of experience on the part of the university faculty in the real world of the community college and failure to involve community colleges in planning and implementing the programs. O'Banion (1972, pp. 90-92) gives four qualifications which he considers minimal for a university which proposes to genuinely serve the staff development needs of the community college:

(1) The university staff must be knowledgeable and experienced regarding the community-junior college.

(2) The university must be willing to develop cooperative relationships with community-junior colleges.

(3) The university should be adjacent to a number of outstanding community-junior colleges.

(4) The university should be an outstanding university in American education, or it should have some special attributes for developing a program for community-junior college staff, or both.

The importance of staffing community college faculty preparation programs with individuals who are experienced in community college work is so obvious as to need no defense. Rather, we should add to this qualification that such a staff should also include members of area minority groups who have had life experiences similar to those of community college students from the same minority population. Still further, community members should be included in the instruction process in the university on permanent consulting and/or occasional faculty basis who are actively involved in social work, civic responsibility, and the everyday world of business and industry (Howe, 1973, p. 58).

Cooperation between the university and the community colleges it attempts to serve is essential. The English faculty preparation program at Carnegie-Mellon, which was mentioned previously, is using as consultants its graduates now actively teaching in community colleges. As a result of feedback from these alumni, the program is modifying its previously literature-dominated course offerings to include such titles as "Language and Thought," "Linguistics for the Classroom," "Social Dialects," and "Teaching Developmental Reading and Writing to Adult Students" (Eastman, 1973, p. 6).

An illustration of more direct cooperation between a university and a specific area community college is seen in the case of Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI/SU) and New River Community College (NRCC), located in southwestern Virginia. NRCC became a community college in 1970 after a ten-year history as an area

vocational school; VPI/SU established a new college of education in 1971. Having accepted the mission of preparing staff for community colleges, this new school of education recruited staff experienced in the community college and with specializations in areas related to the needs of community college students. They also set up an advisory council of community college educators.

The two institutions have proceeded methodically to build two-way coordination between the university and the community college. NRCC includes the provision of VPI/SU coursework on their own campus as part of a planned long-range program for the improvement of instruction. Specialists from the university serve as consultants for workshops on student advisement, community services, articulation, faculty evaluation, and other topics. University faculty assisted in the preparation of master plans for NRCC. The two faculties have cooperated in the development of self-instructional programs for the purpose of training current and new faculty at NRCC.

On the other side of the coin, VPI/SU has leaned heavily on NRCC as a laboratory and demonstration center for its faculty preparation programs, for orientation field trips, for teaching internships, and as a source for guest lecturers for university courses. As a result of the cooperative relationship which they have developed, more than three-fourths of the faculty at NRCC have enrolled in formal community college coursework at the university. "All faculty [at NRCC] have been involved in a planned faculty development program that has been much more comprehensive and enriched than would have been possible if dependent upon the resources of NRCC alone" (Atwell and Sullins, 1973, pp. 32-33).

It is the opinion of this writer that such cooperative arrangements will go a long way toward the solution of the persistent and crucial problem of faculty development in the community college.

In order for such a cooperative arrangement to materialize and be practicable, the university must have geographical proximity to at least one interested community college. For such a cooperative program to reach its full potential in the overall picture, proximity to several community colleges is desirable. The fact that both institutions participate in the same environment and partake of the benefits of the same social improvements gives them a mutual interest in the success of the community college venture in the area. Proximity facilitates communication and travel necessary to advising and consulting, the attendance of community college faculty at university classes, the transporting of university classes to the community college campus, the placement and supervision of interns, involvement in local community processes, etc.

In listing his fourth qualification--the "university should be an outstanding university in American education"--O'Banion (1972, p. 92) is dealing with the assumption that the appropriate degree for the community college teacher is the relatively new Doctor of Arts in Teaching. Because of the newness of this degree and the tendency in higher education toward comparison and hierarchical arrangement of credentials, O'Banion is suggesting that this degree be undertaken by universities with enough prestige to lend it needed status as it becomes established among other teaching credentials. However, O'Banion goes on to suggest that community college staff preparation might be undertaken by other universities which have "some special attributes

for developing a program for community-junior college staff." O'Banion lists examples including Union Graduate School based at Antioch College, upper level universities who rely on community colleges for their junior level entrants, and the California State Colleges with their long history of involvement with the community college.

It is the feeling of this writer that "special attributes" might extend to schools such as VPI/SU and others with an interest in cooperative programs involving area community colleges in a total cooperative faculty development effort. Some attributes which could enhance the likelihood of success might be (1) a flexible, or newly created, or continually innovative school of education, (2) an institutional commitment to community service, urban problems, etc., and (3) an institutional openness to unusual, nontraditional, preferably competency-based program structures.

Universities which qualify under most of these points are certainly rare, and would tend not to be the long established high-prestige universities in this country. But, if we are more concerned with the product than with the degree or the prestige of the degree, we may find that such universities as this would be superior candidates for the development of effective community college faculty preparation programs.

PRESERVICE PROGRAM:
THE UNIVERSITY, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, AND THE COMMUNITY

In the proposed partnership for faculty development in the community college, the preservice faculty preparation program should be the primary responsibility of the university, with continuous advisement, consultation, coordination, and cooperation between the university and the participating community college. Such a preservice program should

also seek the cooperation and assistance of community agencies--especially those which deal with the problems of ethnic minorities, the economically and educationally disadvantaged, and the handicapped. The planning and patterning of the university preservice program should be established in response to local needs and should certainly vary considerably from place to place and from time to time. At this point in time and in most parts of the nation, however, it is proposed that a university faculty preparation program should comprise the following components:

(1) An orientation experience that will sensitize the candidate to the world of the nontraditional student.

(2) An orientation experience that will familiarize the candidate with the real world inside a community college.

(3) Course work in a discipline major with emphasis on content and relationships relevant to community college teaching.

(4) Interdisciplinary seminar experiences to gain understanding of and skill in interdisciplinary planning and teaching.

(5) Course work in basic sociological, psychological, educational, anthropological, and literary concepts dealing with the nontraditional student.

(6) Direct experience to develop an understanding of the different cultures of nontraditional students (e.g. period of part time work with a social agency).

(7) Colloquiums or seminars that focus on selected educational theories and processes such as learning theories and teaching methodologies, curriculum theory and development, effective use of media and other learning resources, program development, and evaluation of learning--all with special emphasis on applications to teaching the nontraditional student.

(8) A supervised teaching internship in a community college with (as nearly as possible) full faculty status and full responsibility for students.

(9) Supervised projects involving experimentation or research in community college education or related community problems.

This list of recommended components is indeed a "large order," and the question arises as to how long the candidate will remain in

preservice training in order to complete these learning experiences. Also, since this pattern of activities is not typical of anything we recognize in current degree programs, we tend immediately to wonder what degree might be granted to the individual who completes such a program.

Many constraints other than the wishes of the university staff and of the faculty and administration of the community college will come to bear on the question of the degree to be offered. Generally speaking, however, a basic degree of Master of Arts in Teaching, innovatively administered, would allow for the acquisition by most candidates of most of the competencies desired. Where desired, any of the components listed could be applied toward the Bachelor of Technology for industrial and technical instructors seeking that degree. Perhaps additional work in the subject discipline and a formal research paper in the field of community college education might be included for a DAT program. Planning of the individual candidate's program of studies and evaluation of his readiness for the appropriate degree should be based on competencies achieved. Full recognition (including appropriate course credit) should be given for competencies possessed by the candidate as a result of educational or life experiences outside the formal educational establishment.

Still, in many cases, choices will have to be made; every student, given the normal duration of an MAT program, will not be able to achieve all of the competencies recommended nor would he be able to undertake all of the program components listed above. In such cases, the choice must be made concerning the most urgent of the competencies to be developed <u>before</u> beginning to teach and components related to those

competencies should be included in the candidate's preservice program. It should be remembered that in the proposed cooperative relationship between the university and the community college, it will be difficult to tell where preservice preparation leaves off and inservice continuing development begins. Atwell and Sullins (1973, p. 32) in reporting on the program at VPI/SU quote Thornton as saying, "... the prospective teacher is not--cannot be--fully prepared at the time he obtains his first position." But with a continuing cooperative program in which the community college is participating, he need not terminate his professional development at that point.

As has been previously suggested, the community college plays a vital role in the successful preservice faculty preparation program. For such a partnership to be optimally effective, the community college must be ready to provide:

(1) Interested individuals from the community college staff to serve on an advisory council for planning and implementation of the faculty preparation program.

(2) Access to the community college campus and cooperation of staff for orientation sessions introducing new teacher candidates to the community college.

(3) Interested faculty in discipline areas to serve on advisory committees with staff in their corresponding discipline areas in the university.

(4) Personnel to serve as speakers, to give demonstrations, etc., for university classes and seminars.

(5) Internship placement and supervision.

(6) Facilities and staff assistance for on-campus classes and seminars.

(7) Research opportunities for teacher candidates in the university program.

(8) Advice on selection of candidates for the preservice program with particular attention to projected needs by disciplines and to reaching ethnic balance in the community college staff which reflects the proportions in the community.

INSERVICE PROGRAM:

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, THE UNIVERSITY, THE COMMUNITY

In the proposed partnership arrangement, the inservice faculty development program should be primarily the responsibility of the faculty member himself with cooperation and assistance from the community college in which he is employed. Some writers recently have proposed a new staff position in community colleges, the position which O'Banion (1972, p. 94) calls a Staff Development Officer and Charles Collins (1973) calls a Professional Development Facilitator. According to O'Banion, the "primary purpose of the staff development officer is to develop and coordinate self-development programs for staff that lead to improved learning for students." He goes on to share his conviction that faculty members "want to improve their teaching ... want to learn about new approaches to learning and new resources for assisting learning. If suitable guidance and appropriate recognition are provided, staff members will embrace a well designed and nonthreatening staff development plan with enthusiasm."

The success of an inservice staff development program depends to a great extent on the internal organization of the community college and the climate for change maintained within the institution. Given an organization in which faculty members participate in goal setting and planning related to their own work; given an organizational climate in which innovation is encouraged by lowering the threat attached to unsuccessful experimentation; we can expect that faculty members will be eager to take advantage of opportunities to increase their awareness, their understandings, and their instructional skills.

Some institutions are currently experimenting with staff development programs based on a participative "management by objectives" model. In such programs, the faculty member reviews his instructional outcomes (attrition rates, grade distributions, student achievements, student evaluations of teaching, etc.), his own contribution to institutional and community affairs, and his own professional development needs; then, basing his decisions on his own evaluation, he makes up a set of objectives for a quarter, semester, or year. These professional development objectives are presented to his department chairman (or whoever is in the role of immediate supervisor); they are discussed and possibly adjusted by concensus. This set of objectives is later used to evaluate the instructor's progress in professional development. (One similar model at Golden West Community College in California is described by Brawer, 1973, p. 57.) Evaluations of this sort for the purpose of staff development and the improvement of instruction should never be tied in with matters of salary determination or to questions of retention or dismissal of faculty (Richardson, 1973, p. 19).

In the case of a community college with a Professional Development Facilitator, the objectives for the individual faculty member might be an outgrowth of conferences with the PDF. A further responsibility of this office would be to collect and review the professional development plans, confer with faculty members as seems advisable, and to collate the objectives and facilitate their achievement. Arrangements would be made for workshops, university courses on campus, faculty seminars, travel, books, consultants, etc., for groups and individuals, combining efforts and coordinating resources to meet the various development needs.

Finally the PDF should follow through on evaluation of outcomes. The separation of this office from all processes related to salary determination and questions of retention and dismissal should be held inviolable.

The tasks of advising, coordinating, and planning for an institution-wide staff development program of the type described here would probably be excessive if carried out in addition to other duties by the Dean of Instruction or any other administrator. In cases, therefore, where the position of Professional Development Facilitator has not been created, departments may attempt to manage their staff development efforts within the department. This arrangement is likely to result in either less effective programs or duplication of effort and expense or both. The 1973 AACJC Staff Development Survey (Chávez, 1973, p. 23) reported that less than 1% of responding institutions had a position which could be classified as a Staff Development Officer or Professional Development Facilitator. This position should increase significantly in coming months if the community college is to achieve its urgent goals in staff development.

It has been suggested that the university which wishes to know the needs of community college faculty in order to provide for them in preservice programs and through assistance to community college faculty development efforts might well look to see what the community colleges are attempting to do for and with their faculties through inservice programs.

In conducting the 1973 AACJC Staff Development Survey, Chávez (1973, p. 24-25) asked: "What staff development activities (institutes, seminars, workshops, consultants) are being planned by your

college for the period June 1, 1973 to May 31, 1974?" The types of inservice activities which were mentioned most often were seminars and workshops, consultants, faculty orientation, courses (graduate work at four-year institutions), institutes, visitations, colleges participating in consortia, conferences, professional conventions, retreats, self study, and faculty evaluation.

Of possibly even more interest to the university planner might be another list which states the focus of the various workshops, seminars, and institutes. This list consists of 51 different topics. Of these 51 topics, eighteen deal directly with the improvement of instruction--individualizing instruction, educational technology, teaching strategies, evaluation of instruction, etc. Of these eighteen instruction-oriented topics, eight indicated specific concern with teaching the educationally disadvantaged student; three were related to cultural awareness and minority interests; and two were in the area of humanistic education. Each of these instruction-oriented emphases was reported by at least one institution; the highest number for one topic was 58.

In view of these concerns expressed by community college faculty and administrators from across the nation, there seems little doubt that coordination of efforts with a university staff and a university program would not only be feasible, but a very welcome opportunity for the faculty and staff of community colleges. Many of the subjects now being covered in short-term workshops could be incorporated in university courses to be offered on the community college campus. The faculty member would have the advantage of university credit for the purpose of salary advancement (or for loftier reasons) if he so desires.

Opportunities to improve cultural awareness and appreciation could take the form of part-time work experiences with community agencies and could result in a kind of awareness which can never be learned in a classroom or workshop. Again, such experience could yield university credit. Experimental instructional projects could be performed with consultation from university faculty; individual reading courses and seminars could be arranged for faculty with similar needs; projects to research community problems could be undertaken; and any of the university course work related to teaching in the community college would be available to inservice faculty on an individual basis.

These suggestions focus on making available to inservice faculty the elements of the preservice program in the university. In addition to this service, the university staff should be available to assist with workshops and seminars at the community college, to serve as consultants and to assist in making contacts with more distant consultants, to hold area institutes, etc. The university staff should always be in the role of assisting, never directing, the inservice development programs of the community colleges.

GUIDELINES FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF COOPERATIVE FACULTY DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Three areas of coordination must be developed in order to implement a cooperative faculty development program such as has been described in this paper: (1) coordination with the community college, (2) coordination with community social agencies (including business and industry), and (3) coordination with the administration of the university and with professors in other disciplines. In this section, some basic guidelines will be suggested for coordination in each of these

areas, but there is no intent to suggest that the three areas should be approached sequentially. Actual implementation would probably entail moving forward on all three fronts simultaneously.

Coordination with the Community College

Whether a community college teacher preparation program is already in existence in the university (and the desire is to change to the cooperative version) or whether such a program is being initiated, the following steps should be followed to establish needed cooperation and coordination:

(1) The university and the community college (only one community college at the beginning) should begin communications. Representatives from both institutions should meet and discuss needs (chiefly the faculty development needs of the community college). These representatives, in a series of conversations, should discuss frankly the relative interest of their institutions (internally), and explore their mutual capabilities as participants in such a joint venture.

(2) The representatives of the two institutions should list the total hoped-for cooperative activities; then, after careful consideration, they should select one or two activities with which they wish to begin their coordination of effort.

(3) Commitments and responsibilities should be clear and detailed and in writing (e.g. responsibility for supervision of interns, or how much discretion the community college will have relative to selection of candidates for the preservice program.)

(4) A continuing advisory council from the community should be appointed and regular meetings should be scheduled for ongoing coordination of program.

(5) The demands (needs) of the community college should serve to establish, as far as feasible, the order in which new cooperative activities are added; but the pace of increased cooperative endeavor should be controlled such that each undertaking can be achieved well and the relationships and responsibilities worked out thoroughly for each new venture without pressure from too many new involvements at one time.

(6) The university should work with only one community college at first, then, when that cooperative program is well established, consider a second pairing with another community college, etc., giving each pairing time to work out individually before assuming another. Many components will be common to the cooperative patterns with all of the affiliated community colleges; but each institution is unique and no two cooperative arrangements can possibly be identical if each is serving optimally the unique needs of the institution concerned.

These six points are not exhaustive and, of course, grossly oversimplify the process of coordination. The main principles intended are (1) that cooperation be overt and explicit with openness at all stages, and (2) that it will prove advantageous to limit the growth of the cooperative program to the addition of one community college at a time. It is greatly to be preferred that the university program be made to function effectively with one institution rather than to generalize its cooperative services to too many too soon.

Coordination with Community Agencies

The functioning of the university faculty development program which we have described will require close cooperation with community agencies. Such agencies can provide speakers, workshop leaders, advisors, orientation sites, and work experiences for teacher candidates and inservice community college personnel. In the earliest exploratory stages of planning, the leaders of the university program should make contacts with agencies which might advise the planners and offer meaningful experiences for trainees. Such contacts should include the Department of Social Services, the Department of Health, the Rehabilitation Commission, Mental Health and Mental Retardation Centers, Planned Parenthood Agencies, the Probation Courts, and the Employment Commission.

There should be exploratory discussion between the university program leaders and the administrators of each agency contacted. Discussion should be based on open statements of goals, needs, capacities, and willingness to become involved. Eventually, in cases involving long-range commitments such as supervision of work experiences for candidates, detailed statements of expectations and obligation should be drawn up which clearly delineate such points as length and type of work experiences and responsibility for supervision.

Representatives from business and industry are usually more than glad to be called upon to discuss with educators anything which has to do with the development of current employees or the preparation of potential employees. The university program leaders should ascertain especially which industries are being served by the industrial and technical programs in the community colleges of the area, remembering

that a high percentage of the community college students are already employed, many working full time while attending classes to upgrade their skills.

Care should be taken to try to involve those individuals from industry who can speak most directly to on-the-job problems--communications needs, interpersonal skills, problems of punctuality, motivation, and perseverance and specific job skills required. The insights to be gained from an industrial worker or foreman might be more pertinent to dealing with the community college student than the opinions of the president of the firm.

Field trips might be arranged so that teacher candidates and inservice trainees can visit the industries in which their students are working or for whose work force their students are being prepared. Too many social science, math, and English teachers (and technical instructors, too) have no notion of what it is like on the inside of a factory. Whatever formal arrangements need to be made for the participation of business and industry in the university program should be made well in advance, should be calendared, and carried out as planned. The eager cooperation which community colleges receive from business and industry would lead us to expect the same will be available to a university program upon request.

Coordination within the University

In order for a community college faculty development program to thrive and be effective in a university setting, there must be a commitment to the program and its goals on the part of the administration and on the part of the discipline departments which will be involved.

Before launching such a program, the prospective program leaders should ascertain the extent of the commitment of the top administration and all administrators whose decisions will directly affect institutional support. In most cases, an attempt should be made to determine whether this administration has previously supported community involvement in the areas of social science, psychology, political science, and education. The attitude of key administrators toward the college of education and its involvements with the public schools should also be observed. If the college of education has participated in public school laboratory experiences, or if efforts have been made to move more of the teacher preparation experiences out of the university and into the schools and community, it would be well to know how such efforts have been viewed by the university administration. Determinations should be made as to the extent to which university resources are allocated to programs involving community service in general and teacher preparation in particular.

Eventually, a proposal delineating goals of the proposed program, the means by which these goals will be reached, the support available from the community college and the community, the types of support needed from the administration, and a plan for evaluation of outcomes should be presented to appropriate administrators for their reaction. The proposal should be discussed, problems and constraints recognized, and the commitment of the administration ascertained before proceding with the establishment of the program. Necessary approvals of governing and accrediting agencies must, of course, also be obtained.

Another important group within the university whose interest and commitment must be obtained consists of the professors in other

departments who will instruct the community college faculty candidates and inservice personnel in discipline-oriented course work.

In an ideal world, the community college teacher candidates and their inservice counterparts would receive instruction in their disciplines which would tend toward the generalized rather than the specialized; which would demonstrate the relationships of the discipline to the "real life" world of citizenship, work, and leisure; and which would make explicit the many relationships between their chosen discipline and others which will be a part of their students' total programs. In the real world inside universities, however, such is rarely the case.

Professors in the major university disciplines are themselves highly specialized and highly motivated disciples of the discipline they have chosen. Usually they have not been prepared through formal education to teach the discipline; usually they are scholars of the "pure" in their discipline rather than practioners of the "applied." The liberal arts professor who has an interest in pedagogy is, perhaps, atypical--but such professors do exist and can be found in every university.

The program we have been describing cannot be implemented optimally without the interest and cooperation of professors in the disciplines which candidates are preparing to teach. The commitment and involvement of academic professors is stressed by J.N. Hook (1973, p. iii) in a monograph concerning the Training of Teacher Trainers (TTT) Program 1968-1973; "... since teacher preparation does not take place only in departments of education, the whole-hearted involvement of academic professors is imperative." He states further: "If administrators

and senior professors get keenly interested in teacher preparation ... their influence will carry over to the rest of the university faculty."

The TTT program sets a success pattern for involvement of academic professors in the real issues of teacher preparation. The cooperative activities in which academic professors participated included (1) discussions with professors in the college of education concerning the needs of prospective teachers, (2) discussions concerning the needs of the future students of those prospective teachers, (3) visits by the academic professors to actual classes in schools of the type in which the teacher candidates were preparing to teach, (4) seminars which brought together professors from different disciplines. Some of the results have been an increased concern for education and for pedagogical principles, and concern for the sociological impact of their work as translated into outreach by their teacher candidate students.

The increased involvement of these professors in matters related to teacher preparation has resulted in several observable changes. Course offerings and course content have been adjusted toward learnings more relevant to future students of teacher candidates; attention to interdisciplinary relationships has increased; and many of the professors involved in the project have introduced innovative teaching methods in their own classes, thus giving their students better models of effective teaching in their own discipline. The increased consciousness of their role as "teachers of teachers" has noticeably enriched the learning experiences of their students (Hook, 1973).

The universities which were involved in the TTT project are by no means unique in having professors who can be interested in teacher

preparation. There are many universities in which teacher preparation at the undergraduate and graduate level is a respected part of the total curriculum and where cooperation between the college of education and the college of the liberal arts is a condition of long standing. An action-oriented, community centered, socially concerned faculty preparation program of the type we have been describing should capture the interest and imaginative cooperation of discipline professors in almost any university where it might be implemented.

SUMMARY

Community colleges across the country have opened their doors to all adults who wish to pursue further education. The people are coming into these colleges by the tens of thousands--people with widely differing ethnic origins, cultural backgrounds, educational preparation, interests, abilities, and aspirations.

The faculty in these institutions have not been prepared through preservice education or through previous teaching experiences to teach adult students with the variety of needs and orientations which are now characteristic of the community college student population. As a result of this and other institutional unpreparedness, a large percentage of nontraditional students, having entered the open door in faith, are leaving the community college in disillusionment--their last hope for the fruits of further education seemingly dashed for all time.

The typical community college today is filled to overflowing with students having special needs; at the same time, it is staffed with faculty who are deeply and genuinely concerned but who lack the specialized understandings and skills required to cope with those needs.

The solution seems to lie in appropriate staff development efforts. This paper has proposed a total staff development program which involves a partnership between the university and the community college. This partnership plan provides for both preservice and inservice faculty development for community college instructors with emphasis on the needs of the nontraditional student--the culturally different, the educationally disadvantaged, the high-risk student--the "new student" in the ranks of education for adult learners.

The need is urgent; the community colleges are aware and are attempting to provide solutions out of their own resources. While struggling to retrain their instructional staffs on their own, they have called out to the universities for meaningful cooperation and assistance. It is time for the university colleges of education to become seriously concerned with the needs of the community colleges. It is time for them to marshal their resources in cooperation with the community colleges themselves and other community agencies toward the development of faculty understandings and skills necessary to meet the demands. As long as the university neglects its role in the professional preparation of faculty and staff for these institutions, it must share with the community college the responsibility for every unmet need, every unfulfilled hope of the people who are coming to the people's college.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. An Agenda for National Action Report of the 1972 Assembly of the AACJC. Washington, D.C., 1973.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Staff Development Catalog. Washington, D.C., 1973.

American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. New Staff for New Students, Report of the 1973 Assembly of the AACJC. Unpublished document; to be published by AACJC, 1974.

Atwell, Charles A., and W. Robert Sullins. "Cooperative Faculty Development." Community and Junior College Journal. Vol. 44, No. 3, November 1973.

Brawer, Florence B. "Community Colleges: Selecting and Training New Teachers. Change. Vol. 5, No. 8, October 1973.

Chávez, José. Summary of Results: Staff Development Survey. Washington, D.C. AACJC, 1973.

Collins, Charles C. "College Environment as a Determinant in Staff Development. Unpublished paper prepared for the 1973 AACJC Assembly. To be published in New Staff for New Students (the Assembly report), 1974.

Cross, K. Patricia. Beyond the Open Door. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Inc., 1971.

Eastman, Arthur M. "Developing Special Teaching Degrees." Unpublished paper prepared for the 1973 AACJC Assembly. To be published in New Staff for New Students (the Assembly report), 1974.

Hook, J.N. One Dollar Gets You Ten: TTT as an Educational Catalyst. Durant, Oklahoma: Southeastern State College Research Foundation, Inc., 1973.

Howe, Harold II. "Improving Teacher Education Through Exposures to Reality." In Donald J. McCarty (Ed.) New Perspectives on Teacher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco; Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.

Moore, William, Jr. Against the Odds. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1970.

O'Banion, Terry. Teachers for Tomorrow: Staff Development in the Community-Junior College. Tuscon, Arizona: The University of Arizona Press, 1972.

Richardson, Richard C. "Can Evaluation Improve Instruction." Community and Junior College Journal. Vol. 44, No. 3, November 1973.

Roueche, John E. and R. Wade Kirk. Catching Up: Remedial Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

JAN 20 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES